United Nations A/54/226/Add.2

General Assembly

Distr.: General
23 November 1999
English
Original: English/Russian

Fifty-fourth session
Agenda item 76 (b)
General and complete disarmament: transparency in armaments

United Nations Register of Conventional Arms

Report of the Secretary-General

Addendum

Contents

		Page
II.	Information received from Governments	2
	A. Composite table of replies of Governments	2
	B. Replies received from Governments	3
III.	Index of background information provided by Governments for the calendar year 1998	6
IV.	Information received from Governments on procurement from national production and military holdings	7
Annex		
II.	Views received from Governments in accordance with paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 53/77 S	9

99-35791 (E) 301199

II. Information received from Governments

A. Composite table of replies of Governments[1]

State	Data on exports	Data on imports	Explanation submitted in note verbale	Background information
Honduras	nil	nil		no
Philippines	nil	yes		yes
Russian Federation	yes	nil		no
Spain	nil	yes		yes

[1] With the submission of Honduras, Philippines, Russian Federation and Spain, the total number of replies received from Governments has risen to 78.

B. Replies received from Governments

PHILIPPINES

IMPORTS

Reporting Country: PHILIPPINES

Original language: English
Background information provided: Yes

Calendar year: 1998
Date of submission: 2 November 1999

A	B	C	D	E	Remarks	
Category (I-VII)	Final Importer State(s)	Number of items	State of origin (if not exporter)	Intermediate location (if any)	Description of item	Comments on the transfer
II. Armoured combat vehicles	Philippines	5	United States of America	PA	V-150 Commando	FMS
		2	United States of America	PN	V-300	FMS
		8	United States of America	PN	78 FTR-PCF	FMS
IV. Combat aircraft	Philippines	2	Jordan	PAF	F-5	FMS
		2	United States of America	PAF	C-130	FMS
V. Attack helicopters	Philippines	33	United States of America	PAF	MG-520	FMS

VI. Warships	Philippines	16	United States of America	PN	3"50	FMS
		14	United States of America	PN	30mm(Emerfec)	FMS
		4	United States of America	PN	25mm	FMS
		127	United States of America	PN	20mm ME 4(S)	FMS
		5/3	Republic of Korea/ United Kingdom	PN	PKM/Peacock	Procurement
VII. Missiles and missile launchers	Philippines	200 pcs	United States of America	PAF	LAU-131	FMS
		10,680 pcs	United States of America	PAF	BX MTR MK 40/56	FMS

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

EXPORTS

Reporting Country: Russian Federation

Original language: Russian
Background information provided: No

Calendar year: 1998
Date of submission: 15 October 1999

A	B	C	D	E	Remarks	
Category (I-VII)	Final Importer State(s)	Number of items	State of origin (if not exporter)	Intermediate location (if any)	Description of item	Comments on the transfer
I. Battle Tanks	No deliveries	3				
II. Armoured combat vehicles	Angola United Arab Emirates Hungary Sri Lanka	65 82 99 30				
III. Large calibre artillery systems	Ethiopia	12				
IV. Combat aircraft	Angola Belarus Eritrea Ethiopia	6 2 6 8				
V. Attack helicopters	Chad Sri Lanka	2 3				
VI. Warships	China	1				
VII. Missiles and missile launchers	India	44				

III. Index of background information provided by Governments for the calendar year 1998

State	Title	Language
Honduras	Military holdings as at 30 August 1999	Spanish
Spain	Military holdings as of 31 December 1998. Procurement through national production. Relevant policies and procedures of Spain for the transfer of defence equipment.	Spanish

IV. Information received from Governments on procurement from national production and military holdings

HONDURAS[1]

MILITARY HOLDINGS
(As at 30 August 1999)

Category	Army	Navy	Air Force	Total
I. Battle tanks	32			32
III. Large calibre artillery systems	95		5	100
IV. Combat aircraft		27		27
VI. Warships			25	25
VII. Missile and missile launchers		30		30

Note: The battle tanks meet the calibre specifications (76 mm), but not the required tonnage (9 tons).

[1] Honduras submitted a nil report on procurement through national production

SPAIN

MILITARY HOLDINGS

Category	Army	Navy	Air Force	Total
I. Battle tanks	618	16	-	634
II. Armoured combat vehicles	1,874	68	6	1,948
III. Large calibre artillery systems	1,265	18	-	1,283
IV. Combat aircraft	-	17	200	217
V. Attack helicopters	28	28	-	56
VI. Warships	-	38	-	38
VII. Missile and missile launchers	-	315	830	1,145

PROCUREMENT THROUGH NATIONAL PRODUCTION

A	B	C	REMARKS
Category (I-VII)	Number of items	Description of item	Comments
VI. Warships	1	LPD "GALICIA"	Commissioned on 30 April 1998

Annex II

Views received from Governments in accordance with paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 53/77 S

Egypt

[Original: English]
[26 October 1999]

Since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 46/36 L on 6 December 1991, in which the Assembly established the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, Egypt has contributed faithfully to advocating the principle of transparency in military matters and has been supportive of the objectives underlying the establishment of the Register.

Egypt views transparency in armaments as an important confidence-building measure and consequently perceives the United Nations Register as a confidence-building mechanism, not as an arms-control one. Transparency thus is a measure that should facilitate tangible progress in the field of general and complete disarmament and presents an exceptional opportunity to contribute effectively to common efforts to cultivate a higher degree of security among States.

Transparency, however, is merely an element among a variety of confidence-building measures. Its primary objective is to eliminate suspicion and possible miscalculations of perceived security threats, thereby easing tension and lessening the possibility of military confrontation.

The United Nations Register is, above all, a global undertaking which undoubtedly has a significant effect in both global and regional contexts. Egypt, as generally perceived, recognizes the Register in its current form as an important first step towards the promotion of transparency in all military matters.

The modest initial steps to establish the Register in 1991 were recognized and accepted as a practical necessity. The evolutionary nature of this mechanism was made abundantly clear in resolution 46/36 L. It was clear then that there was a prescribed time-frame for such an evolution to be completed, that being the work of the 1994 Group of Experts mandated to undertake that task.

Egypt is disappointed not only at the outcome of the work of the 1994 Group of Experts, but also at the work done by the 1997 Group of Experts. Both were unable to reach any agreement on related aspects of the further development of the Register.

Egypt is totally convinced that the principle of transparency should apply to all types of armaments, including all weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons, and to transfers of equipment and technology directly related to the development and manufacture of such weapons, as well as to high technology with military applications. In this context, the priorities in the field of disarmament agreed to in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly must be kept in mind when addressing either disarmament or the collateral measure thereof, i.e., transparency.

In Egypt's view, the Register must meet the following requirements:

1. It should be a non-discriminatory, universal and comprehensive confidence-building measure.

2. It should be based on rights and obligations for all States.

3. It should be applied in such a way so as not to infringe on the legitimate security concerns of States and their right to individual and collective self-defence, as recognized in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

4. It should provide for the broadest degree of transparency in the field of all types of armaments and related components, whether conventional or non-conventional.

It is the common understanding among a large number of States that the comprehensive character of the Register entails the expansion of its scope and its further development so as to:

(a) Incorporate information on existing stockpiles, indigenous production capabilities and procurement through national production;

(b) Encompass additional categories, including on all weapons of mass destruction, which is imperative in view of the far-reaching threat that these weapons pose to international peace and security.

The achievement of transparency cannot be based on a selective approach. Such an approach is definitely counterproductive and would contribute to a loss of confidence and an inability to rely on the information which the Register provides in assessing the security needs of States.

Egypt does not consider transparency as a negotiable commodity but as a conceptual whole, and it must be dealt with accordingly. As generally agreed, transparency is not an end in itself, but simply a means contributing towards the elimination of the threats that armaments of all types continue to pose.

As we were unimpressed by the prospect of the possible eventual development of the Register in terms of expansion of its scope since the adoption of resolution 46/36 L, we were neither willing nor able to continue to rely on a mere "mirage" of hope. It became an imperative need to introduce a new resolution under the item entitled "Transparency in armaments" in order to balance shy language only intended to preserve an ineffective mechanism, which, in its current state of distress, is detrimental to our national security.

Egypt expects that the 2000 Group of Experts would find, in the views expressed in the present Secretary-General's report, a good basis for reaching agreement on the early expansion of the scope of the Register and further developing the Register to apply transparency to all weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons, and to transfers of equipment and technology directly related to the development and manufacture of such weapons, as well as to high technology with military applications.

Egypt views with grave concern and deep regret the continued reluctance among some of the adamant supporters of the Register to engage themselves in genuine and sincere efforts directed towards achieving comprehensive transparency. It is now apparent that ulterior motives and interests of certain groups are involved. If this unfortunate spirit continues to prevail, and once again the 2000 Group of Experts fails to faithfully fulfil its real task as primarily anticipated in resolution 46/36 L, little hope will remain for the Register to prosper in the future.